

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 075801

15

ORIGIN SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 R

DRAFTED BY ACDA/IR:THIRSCHFELD

APPROVED BY ACDA/IR:DKLEIN

PM/DCA:VBAKER

EUR/RPM:GHELMAN

NSC:MHIGGINS (SUBS)

JCS:CALDERMAN

C:HSOHNENFELDT

DOD/ISA:LMICHAEL

S/S - MR.ORTIZ

----- 106915

R 032209Z APR 75

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USMISSION NATO

S E C R E T STATE 075801

EXDIS

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT:MBFR EXPERTS TRILATERALS

1. SUMMARY: EXPERTS TRILATERAL TALKS ON MBFR CEILINGS
ISSUES WERE HELD IN WASHINGTON MARCH 20-21 UNDER ACDA
CHAIRMANSHIP (WITH ALL AGENCIES REPRESENTED). UK TEAM
CONSISTED OF WOOD (FCO), GERAHTY (MOD), AND MAKINS (EMBASSY);
FRG REPRESENTED BY RUTH (FOREIGN OFFICE), TANDECKI AND
WIESMANN (MOD). MAJOR POINTS INCLUDED FRG INTEREST IN
MINIMAL REFERENCE TO CEILINGS IN PRESENTING OPTION III
SECRET

PAGE 02 STATE 075801

TO THE OTHER SIDE IN CONTRAST TO UK PREFERENCE FOR SOME
INITIAL EXPLANATION OF CEILINGS; STRONG FRG AND EVEN
STRONGER UK REEMPHASIS ON COMMON CEILING AS OBJECTIVE OF
TRADE; APPARENT ANGLO-GERMAN PREFERENCE FOR NARROWEST

PRACTICAL DEFINITION OF AIRCRAFT TO AVOID COVERAGE OF EUROPEANS. LATTER ISSUE TOOK SHARPEST FORM IN DISCUSSION# ABOUT DEFINING NUCLEAR-CAPABLE AIRCRAFT BY TASK (INITIAL UK AND FRG PREFERENCE) RATHER THAN MODELS OR TYPES, AS SUGGESTED IN THE US PAPER. US POINTED OUT PROBLEMS RE NEGOTIABILITY AND OVERSIGHT BY EAST OF WESTERN MILITARY PLANNING AND INTELLIGENCE METHODS INHERENT IN TASKING DEFINITION. UK AND FRG WILL REVIEW THEIR POSITION IN LIGHT OF DISCUSSIONS. TALKS WERE ALSO HELPFUL IN CLARIFYING PROBABLE EFFECTS ON ALLIED FORCES OF SEEKING

TO COVER SOVIET SYSTEMS RECIPROCALLY. UK CONTENDED THAT SOME RESTRAINTS ON SOVIETS HAD ALWAYS BEEN BRITISH PREFERENCE FOR POLITICAL REASONS, ALTHOUGH THEY SEEMED PREPARED TO RECONSIDER THEIR POSITION. FRG FOR ITS PART WISHED TO AVOID COVERAGE OF ALLIED FORCES, ESPECIALLY CONVENTIONAL FORCES, AND, TO THIS END, SEEMED TO PREFER MINIMUM RECIPROCITY IN WESTERN PRESENTATION. RUTH PUT FORWARD, AS PERSONAL SUGGESTION, A PACKAGE WHICH WOULD INCLUDE US AND SOVIET NO-INCREASE COMMITMENTS ON SYSTEMS WITHDRAWN IN CATEGORY I (US OPTION III ELEMENTS AND SOVIET TANKS) AND A TEMPORARY NO-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON AGGREGATE EAST-WEST NUMBERS OF WARHEADS ONLY, IN ADDITION TO NO-INCREASE OF GROUND AND AIR MANPOWER BETWEEN PHASES.

2. US AGREED TO REMAIN IN TOUCH WITH LONDON AND BONN THROUGH DIPLOMATIC CHANNELS AND OFFERED TO PRODUCE A NEW VERSION OF "US VIEWS" PAPER TAKING TRILATERAL RESULTS INTO ACCOUNT. AFTER CLEARANCE IN WASHINGTON THIS PAPER WOULD BE PASSED TO LONDON AND BONN TO PERMIT FRG AND UK CONSIDERATION IN ARRIVING AT THEIR RESPECTIVE NATIONAL DECISIONS ON OPTION III. US WOULD PLAN TO INTRODUCE PAPER INTO THE NAC ONE TO TWO WEEKS AFTER IT IS GIVEN TO UK AND FRG. US SIDE EMPHASIZED THAT US WISHED TO MAINTAIN MOMENTUM ON INTRODUCING OPTION III INTO NEGOTIATIONS BUT WAS NOT COMMITTED TO ANY PARTICULAR DATE. END SUMMARY.
SECRET

PAGE 03 STATE 075801

3. NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES. BOTH RUTH AND WOOD MISINTERPRETED TREATMENT OF TANK/NUCLEAR TRADES IN US CEILINGS PAPER AS DEEMPHASIS OF COMMON CEILING OBJECTIVE. THEY APPRECIATED OUR AFFIRMATION THAT OPTION III TRADE DID NOT INVOLVE ANY CHANGE IN THE BASIC ALLIED APPROACH OR THE ESTABLISHED GOALS WHICH INCLUDED AGREEMENT TO THE COMMON CEILING. FRG SPOKESMEN ARGUED FOR RETAINING SEPARATION OF TWO PHASES AND EMPHASIS ON GROUND MANPOWER.

4. NEGOTIATING TACTICS: WOOD SAID THAT UK FAVORED SOME SIGNAL OR PERHAPS ELABORATION OF CEILINGS AT THE TIME OPTION III IS PUT FORWARD IN VIENNA. HE THOUGHT THAT UNLESS THIS WERE DONE THE EAST WOULD MISINTERPRET WHAT

WAS BEING OFFERED. US SIDE SAID WE PREFERRED UNCOMPLICATED OPTION III OFFER LEAVING IT TO THE SOVIETS TO ASK ABOUT CEILINGS. US SAW NO REASON TO DO SOVIET'S NEGOTIATING FOR THEM. AT END OF DISCUSSION RUTH SEEMED TO AGREE WITH US APPROACH DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN INTERNAL ALLIANCE UNDERSTANDING ABOUT CEILINGS AND WHAT ALLIES WOULD SAY TO SOVIETS AS PART OF INITIAL PRESENTATION. FRG RAISED DANGER THAT SOVIETS MIGHT USE CEILINGS ISSUE TO BROADEN THE TALKS TO INCLUDE OBLIGATIONS FOR ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS.

5. DEFINITIONS: (AIRCRAFT) BOTH UK AND FRG WANTED US OPTION III EQUIPMENT DEFINITIONS WHICH, IF APPLIED TO ALLIED SYSTEMS, WOULD RESULT IN ONLY MINIMAL COVERAGE. UK WAS INTERESTED IN PROTECTING ITS PLANS FOR INTRODUCTION OF ADDITIONAL JAGUARS AND CONVERSION OF ITS F-4 AIRCRAFT TO AIR DEFENSE ROLES. UK REPS PROPOUNDED DEFINITIONS BASED ON TASKING, ADMITTING, HOWEVER, THAT THIS HAS NOT YET BEEN APPROVED BY MINISTERS. TASKING DEFINITION WOULD, IN THE UK REP'S VIEW, PERMIT EACH SIDE TO DETERMINE WHICH OF ITS AIRCRAFT WOULD BE COVERED. IT WOULD PRODUCE MINIMAL RESTRAINTS ON ALLIES WHILE AT SAME TIME SERVING POLITICAL PURPOSE OF PLACING SOME RESTRAINT ON SOVIET SYSTEMS IF ALLIANCE DECIDES TO REQUEST RECIPROCAL CONSTRAINTS. GERMANS ALSO LIKED NUCLEAR TASKING AS LEAST CONSTRAINING DEFINITION. US SIDE EXPLAINED THAT DEFINITIONS BASED UPON AGREEMENT ON LIST OF MODELS OR TYPES WOULD BE MORE READILY UNDERSTOOD BY EAST AND WOULD APPLY ONLY AFTER A GIVEN AIRCRAFT WAS IN THE AREA. IN SECRET

PAGE 04 STATE 075801

ADJUSTING LIST FOR NEW AIRCRAFT MODELS OR TYPES ALLIES COULD RELY ON SUBSTANTIAL AGREEMENT ON WHAT NUCLEAR TYPES AND MODELS ALREADY EXIST. IN CONTRAST, IF ALLIES USED TASKING DEFINITION, THE WESTERN ASSERTIONS OF WHETHER OR NOT AN AIRCRAFT WAS A NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO EXPLAIN AND DEFEND. FURTHERMORE, SOVIETS WOULD BE AWARE THAT ANY PROPOSED LIMITS BASED ON TASKING COULD BE VITIATED BY ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER. THUS THE TASKING DEFINITION INVITED SOVIET ATTENTION TO ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES ON THE WESTERN SIDE AND TO WESTERN NUCLEAR BASING AND TRAINING PRACTICES. FURTHER, DEFINITION BY NUCLEAR TASKING WOULD PERMIT US NUCLEAR-CAPABLE AIRCRAFT WITHDRAWN TO RETURN TO NGA IN A ROLE OTHER THAN NUCLEAR TASKED. FINALLY, IF THERE ARE TO BE RECIPROCAL CONSTRAINTS, WESTERN DECISIONS ON TASKING OF SOVIET AIRCRAFT WOULD ALSO RISK EXPOSING SENSITIVE INTELLIGENCE SOURCES AND METHODS UNLESS SOVIET POSITIONS ON THEIR OWN NUCLEAR TASKING WERE SIMPLY ACCEPTED. UK CONTINUED TO ARGUE THAT EACH SIDE COULD SIMPLY DECLARE WHICH OF ITS AIRCRAFT WERE NUCLEAR TASKED AND OTHER SIDE WOULD ACCEPT THIS DECLARATION, THUS AVOIDING OVERSIGHT AND VERIFICATION PROBLEMS. THE ISSUE REMAINED OPEN.

6. DEFINITIONS (LAUNCHERS): AFTER SOME DISCUSSION, UK AND

FRG REPS SEEMED TO FAVOR A US ALTERNATIVE DEFINITION OF "US LAUNCHERS FOR SURFACE-TO-SURFACE MISSILES WITH RANGE OVER 500 KM", VICE "US PERSHING SURFACE-TO-SURFACE MISSILE LAUNCHERS" ALTHOUGH OFFICIAL UK PREFERENCE REMAINS THAT ALL SSMS SHOULD BE COVERED. US NOTED THAT US ALTERNATIVE DEFINITION ABOVE EXCLUDED ALL CURRENT WESTERN SSMS IN THE AREA EXCEPT PERSHING, THEREBY GIVING ALLIES MAXIMUM FLEXIBILITY. IF APPLIED TO SOVIETS, THIS DEFINITION WOULD EXCLUDE ALL SOVIET SSMS NOW IN THE NGA AND COVER ONLY SSMS WITH GREATER THAN A 500 KM RANGE SUCH AS SCALEBOARD AND SHADDOCK, THUS PREVENTING THEM FROM BEING INTRODUCED INTO THE AREA. ALTHOUGH FRG PAPER ASSUMED LIMITS ON SOVIET SCUDS AND FROGS, IF THERE IS RECIPROCITY, AND UK PAPER SUGGESTED COVERING ALL SSMS, NEITHER UK OR FRG REPS THOUGHT THAT LIMITS ON THESE SOVIET SYSTEMS WERE MILITARILY NECESSARY. NEVERTHELESS, WOOD REPEATED THAT SOME CONSTRAINTS ON SCUD B HAD ALWAYS BEEN UK PREFERENCE.

SECRET

PAGE 05 STATE 075801

7. DEFINITIONS (WARHEADS): BOTH UK AND FRG AGREED WITH US APPROACH OF NOT DEFINING WARHEADS OR SPECIFYING TYPES TO BE WITHDRAWN. US SIDE NOTED THAT US VIEWS PAPER SUGGESTED THAT US WARHEADS COULD BE LIMITED BY A NO-INCREASE OBLIGATION WITHOUT FURTHER SPECIFICATION AS TO TYPE, ALTHOUGH THE LIMITS, INCLUDING ANY RECIPROCAL LIMITS ON SOVIET WARHEADS, WOULD BE VIRTUALLY UNVERIFIABLE. UK AND FRG SPOKESMEN SEEMED TO ACCEPT US APPROACH.

8. RECIPROCITY. ON CATEGORY II LIMITATIONS, THE US VIEWS PAPER PROPOSED THAT SOVIET NUCLEAR SYSTEMS BE LIMITED BY NON-CIRCUMVENTION SUPPLEMENTED BY US UNILATERAL STATEMENT. ALTHOUGH US SPOKESMEN DREW ATTENTION TO THIS FEATURE OF THE US VIEWS PAPER, WE CONFINED INITIAL DISCUSSION OF RECIPROCITY TO ELICITING UK AND FRG VIEWS ABOUT HOW MUCH WAS DESIRABLE, WHILE NOTING POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF INVITING SOVIET DEMANDS FOR CONSTRAINTS ON ALLIED FORCES. WOOD REPEATED THAT THE UK STILL THOUGHT SOME DEGREE OF RESTRAINT ON SOVIET ELEMENTS WAS IMPORTANT FOR POLITICAL REASONS. HE CONCEDED HOWEVER THAT RECIPROCITY WAS NOT MILITARILY NECESSARY, AND THAT IMPORTANCE OF RECIPROCITY DECREASED IF NON-US NATO SYSTEMS WERE NOT LIMITED. RUTH WAS ALSO OF VIEW THAT SOME RECIPROCAL COVERAGE WOULD BE DESIRABLE FOR POLITICAL REASONS, BUT, BECAUSE OF CONCERN ABOUT LIMITING ALLIED FORCES, HE DID NOT FAVOR SPECIFIC LIMITATIONS ON SOVIET NUCLEAR DELIVERY SYSTEMS OR US TANKS.

9. COVERAGE OF ALLIED FORCES: IT WAS CLEAR FROM THE OUTSET OF DISCUSSIONS THAT CATEGORY III (POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS ON ALLIES) WAS CENTRAL FOCUS OF UK AND FRG

INTEREST. GERMANS WERE PARTICULARLY INTERESTED IN
HEADING OFF EXPANSION OF DEFINITIONS TO COVER ALLIED
CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS (TANKS, AIRCRAFT AND SHORTER RANGE
SSMS) OR NUCLEAR DELIVERY SYSTEMS. WOOD DID NOT WANT
DEFINITIONS EXPANDED SO THAT OPTION III MIGHT LEAD
ULTIMATELY TOWARD BROADER NUCLEAR TRADING ON BOTH SIDES.
FRG'S MAIN CONCERN WAS WITH TANKS. FRG SPOKESMEN SAID
RESTRAINTS ON TANKS WOULD BE MORE DAMAGING TO ALLIES THAN
SECRET

PAGE 06 STATE 075801

RESTRAINTS ON NUCLEAR ELEMENTS WOULD BE TO SOVIETS.

10. CONCERNED ABOUT POTENTIAL CODIFICATION OF TANK
DISPARITIES, RUTH SUGGESTED DROPPING SPECIFIC NUMBER OF
TANKS AS REDUCTION OBJECTIVE ON THE GROUNDS THAT REMOVAL
OF A TANK ARMY WOULD IN ANY CASE INVOLVE SIGNIFICANT
NUMBERS OF TANKS. GERMANS FAVORED LETTING MANPOWER
LIMITATIONS AND LIKELY SOVIET DISINCLINATION TO STORE
TANKS HANDLE PROBLEM OF RESTRAINING WP TANKS. RUTH
RECOGNIZED US AND UK ARGUMENTS THAT SPECIFIC NUMBER
OF TANKS (1700) HAD ALREADY BEEN PUT FORWARD AND WAS
A PART OF THE EXISTING ALLIED POSITION, AND THAT EXPERTS
MEETING WAS NOT THE PLACE TO REVAMP ALLIED POSITION.
HE ALSO POINTED TO USING THE EXISTING OFFER OF A
TIME-LIMITED NO INCREASE COMMITMENT ON AIR AND GROUND
MANPOWER AS THE WAY TO DEAL WITH SOVIET ATTEMPTS TO
COVER ALLIED FORCES IN PHASE I. HE RECOGNIZED, HOWEVER,
THAT THIS MIGHT BE INADEQUATE AND SUGGESTED INSTEAD,
FOLLOWING SCENARIO (WHICH HE PUT FORWARD AS HIS PERSONAL
SUGGESTION, UNCLEARED WITH BONN):

-- A. US-SOVIET AGREEMENT TO REDUCE A TANK ARMY OF
68,000 MEN AND 1700 TANKS (USSR), AND 29,000 MEN AND
THE THREE OPTION III NUCLEAR ELEMENTS, HOWEVER DEFINED,
(US).

-- B. A DECLARATION OR AGREEMENT BY THESE TWO PARTIES
TO EXERCISE "SELF-RESTRAINT" AS FOLLOWS:

-- 1. THE USSR WOULD NOT INCREASE RESIDUAL LEVELS
-- OF SOVIET MAIN BATTLE TANKS IN THE AREA;

- 2. THE US WOULD NOT INCREASE RESIDUAL LEVELS
-- OF REDUCED NUCLEAR ELEMENTS IN THE AREA.

-- C. A MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT SUBSCRIBED TO BY ALL
DIRECT PARTICIPANTS TO:

-- 1. IN ADDITION TO A NO-INCREASE OF GROUND AND
-- AIR MANPOWER, ADHERE TO A TEMPORARY NO-INCREASE
SECRET

PAGE 07 STATE 075801

-- IN THE AGGREGATE NUMBER OF NUCLEAR WARHEADS IN
-- THE AREA;

-- 2. PROVIDE FOR A COMMITMENT TO THE COMMON
-- CEILING CONCEPT.

-- RUTH SAID THAT A COMBINATION OF THE ALLIED NO-
INCREASE-IN-MANPOWER FORMULA PLUS A LIMITATION ON WARHEADS
COULD BE USED TO ARGUE THAT THIS COMBINATION COVERING

ALLIED FORCES WAS ALL SOVIETS WOULD GET IN PHASE I, AND
THAT OTHER MOVES IN THIS AREA WERE ONLY POSSIBLE IN THE
FRAMEWORK OF PHASE II DISCUSSIONS. WOOD DISTINGUISHED
BETWEEN A DESIRABLE OPENING POSITION WITH LITTLE
CEILINGS CONTENT AND A POSITION WITH SOME CEILINGS
CONTENT WHICH WOULD BE PUT FORWARD TO RESPOND TO SOVIET
DEMAND TO LIMIT ALLIED ABILITY TO COMPENSATE FOR US
WITHDRAWALS. US SIDE NOTED RUTH IDEA WITH INTEREST BUT
POINTED OUT THAT THIS PROPOSAL IMPLIED A NO-TRANSFER
AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE US AND OTHER ALLIES ON ONE HAND
AND THE SOVIETS AND THE NSWP STATES ON THE OTHER, FOR
THE ELEMENTS REDUCED IN PHASE I. FRG SPOKESMAN AGREED
THAT THIS MIGHT BE PART OF THE PACKAGE. UK AND FRG
SPOKESMEN NOTED THAT THE ISSUE WAS WHETHER THE ALLIES
WILL BE SATISFIED TO TEST OPTION III WITH THE
EAST, WITHOUT INTERNAL ALLIED AGREEMENT ON A CLEAR AND
PLAUSIBLE POSITION ON HOW CATEGORY IIIA SYSTEMS (AIRCRAFT,
SSMS, AND WARHEADS) MIGHT BE COVERED. IN RESPONSE TO THE
QUESTION OF HOW FAR FRG COULD GO ON CATEGORY IIIA
ELEMENTS, RUTH SAID THAT "REALISTICALLY" THE FRG WOULD
HAVE TO EXAMINE A TEMPORARY ALLIED NO-INCREASE UNDERSTAND-
ING ON CATEGORY IIIA SYSTEMS AS AN OUTER LIMIT. UK WAS
UNSURE WHETHER THIS LATTER FORM MIGHT NOT UNDULY CONSTRAIN
INTRODUCTION OF FUTURE ALLIED AIRCRAFT MODELS.

11. UK INITIATED IDEA OF ESTABLISHING A COMMON CEILING
ON REDUCED EQUIPMENT ITEMS AND SUGGESTED THAT THIS MIGHT
BE CONSIDERED AT SOME SUITABLE POINT AS A NEGOTIATING
TACTIC. US HIGHLIGHTED RISKS OF EXPANDING MBFR EQUIPMENT
COVERAGE TO INCLUDE ARTILLERY AND, INFERENTIALLY, OTHER
EQUIPMENT ITEMS AS WELL. FRG IN PARTICULAR WAS CONCERNED
SECRET

PAGE 08 STATE 075801

ABOUT THE DANGERS OF BROADENING NUMBER OF EQUIPMENT ITEMS
COVERED. UK CONCEDED THIS WAS PRINCIPAL WEAKNESS OF
EQUIPMENT COMMON CEILING PROPOSAL.

12. ON PROCEDURE, US SIDE HELD THAT WE SHOULD MAINTAIN
MOMENTUM IN MOVING OPTION III TO NEGOTIATING TABLE. WE
WERE NOT PROPOUNDING SPECIFIC TARGET DATE. USG WOULD

PREPARE FINAL VERSION OF THE "NEXT STEPS" PAPER AS SOON AS POSSIBLE WHICH WOULD HAVE TO BE CLEARED AT POLICY LEVELS. THIS PAPER WOULD TAKE RESULTS OF TRILATERALS INTO ACCOUNT. US THEN PLANNED TO PASS PAPER TO BONN AND LONDON SO THAT THEY WOULD HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN VIEWS OF THEIR MINISTRIES ON OPTION III BEFORE PAPER GOES FORMALLY TO NAC, 1 OR 2 WEEKS THEREAFTER.

13. USG DID NOT PROPOSE FURTHER TRILATERALS, BUT AGREED TO REMAIN IN CONTACT WITH LONDON AND BONN THROUGH

DIPLOMATIC CHANNELS, SEEKING CONSENSUS BUT NOT REPEAT NOT ABSOLUTE AGREEMENT ON ALL DETAILS. BOTH UK AND FRG SPOKESMEN EXPRESSED HOPE THAT PARALLEL TRILATERALS WOULD NOT TAKE PLACE IN VIENNA OR IN CAPITALS. THEY DID NOT INTEND TO ENGAGE IN CEILINGS DISCUSSIONS IN OTHER FORUMS. US SIDE SAID THAT TRILATERAL FOCUS HAD BEEN IN WASHINGTON AND SAW NO NEED TO DUPLICATE IT ELSEWHERE.

14. ACDA ASSISTANT DIRECTOR KLEIN CLOSED THE MEETING BY SAYING THAT WHILE IN INTRODUCING OPTION III, THE ALLIES PROBABLY WOULD PREFER A SOVIET COMMITMENT ON NUCLEAR RESTRAINT, IT WAS CLEAR THAT THE SOVIETS COULD NOT UNDERTAKE MORE COMMITMENT IN MBFR THAN THE WEST COULD. AND THE TRILATERAL DISCUSSIONS CLEARLY POINTED UP THE DIFFICULTIES THAT RECIPROCITY WOULD CREATE FOR THE WEST. PERHAPS A SIMPLER APPROACH, ONE THAT DID NOT CALL FOR RECIPROCAL COMMITMENTS, WAS CALLED FOR, ONE IN WHICH THE SOVIETS AND THE US WOULD ONLY UNDERTAKE NOT TO PUT BACK INTO THE AREA WHAT EACH TOOK OUT. FINALLY, ASSUMING AGAIN THAT OPTION III WILL BE INTRODUCED, THE US WOULD LIKE, AS THE SOVIETS RESPOND TO THE INITIATIVE, SECRET

PAGE 09 STATE 075801

TO CONSULT FURTHER AND CLOSELY WITH THE BRITISH AND GERMANS ON HOW TO PROCEED. INGERSOLL

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 26 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: FORCE & TROOP LEVELS, CONSULTANTS, MEETING PROCEEDINGS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 03 APR 1975
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: CunninFX
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975STATE075801
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: ACDA/IR:THIRSCHFELD
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: D750116-1155
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197504102/baaaagwm.tel
Line Count: 367
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 7
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: CunninFX
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 07 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <07 APR 2003 by KelleyW0>; APPROVED <16 SEP 2003 by CunninFX>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: n/a
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: BONN
LONDON
MBFR VIENNA
NATO
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006

